



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/821,183

03/29/2001

Srinivas Gutta

US010105

4515

24737

7590

08/12/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

AKLILU, KIRUBEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/821,183

Applicant(s)

GUTTA ET AL.

Examiner

Kirubel Aklilu

Art Unit

2617

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11-19,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11-19,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/13/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/05 have been fully considered but the arguments discussed below have been found not to be persuasive.

With regards to Claims 1, 11, and 21, the applicant argues that the limitation of "rule" is not met. As per the definition of a "rule" submitted by applicant, a rule is "in expert systems, a conditional statement that tells the system how to react to a particular situation". Imagawa et al. do teach such a rule in col. 11 lines 52-62 "When a person picks up the telephone receiver, the control object candidate determination section 3 determines as a candidate the television that outputs sound, and the control content candidate determination section 4 determines the reduction of the sound volume as a candidate for the content of control." The condition is a person who picks up the telephone receiver and the reaction to situation is the reduction of the sound volume.

With regard to Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, the applicant argues "The activity is detected, per the independent claims from which these depend, by use of audio and/or video focused on the user". The examiner would like to remind the applicant that these claims are rejected under U.S.C. 103 (a) Imagawa et al. in view of Kimoto et al., and therefore, the limitation of the independent claim "by use of audio and/or video focused on the user" is found in Imagawa et al. as shown in the rejection of Claim 1.

Art Unit: 2617

With regard of Claims 2,7,12,17 and 3,8,13,18, the examiner found the applicant's argument are persuasive and have cited new art for the rejection of these claims. This Office Action is not made final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims **1,5-6,11,15-16, 21-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Imagawa et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,353,764)

1. As for **Claim 1**, Imagawa et al. teaches a method for controlling a media player (see col. 5 lines 17-25 "There may be one or several candidates. If, for example, the person selected as the operator is pointing toward an air conditioner and a television, both of them are to be controlled . . . for example, the uttered word "television" allows a television (or televisions) to be used as a candidate for a control object."), comprising:

establishing at least one rule defining a predefined user activity, said rule including at least one condition and an action item to be performed to automatically adjust said media player when said rule is satisfied (see col. 1 lines 47– 63 "This invention provides a control method characterized in that the attributes of one or several people are continuously or intermittently monitored to control predetermined equipment based on the detection of the people's predetermined attribute");

analyzing at least one of audio and video information focused on a user to identify said condition (see col. 2 lines 31-40 "the monitoring section 1 continuously monitors people's attributes and their peripheral environment. The people's attributes include people's positions, postures, faces, expressions, eyes or head directions, motions, voices, physiological conditions. . ."); and

performing said action item if said rule is satisfied (see col. 11 lines 52-62 "When a person picks up the telephone receiver, the control object candidate determination section 3 determines as a candidate the television that outputs sound, and the control content candidate determination section 4 determines the reduction of the sound volume as a candidate for the content of control.").

2. As for **Claim 5** Imagawa et al. teach said user activity is a predefined gesture command and said action item is the issuance of a corresponding command to said media player (see col. 11 lines 52-58 "When a person makes a motion of applying forefinger to the front of the mouth or plugging the ears with the hands, the control object candidate determination section 3 determines as a candidate the television that outputs sound, and the control content candidate determination section 4 determines the reduction of the sound volume as a candidate for the content of control.").

3. As for **Claim 6**, Imagawa et al. teaches a method for controlling a media player, comprising:

analyzing at least one of audio and video information focused on a user to identify at least one predefined user activity (see col. 1 lines 47–63 “This invention provides a control method characterized in that the attributes of one or several people are continuously or intermittently monitored to control predetermined equipment based on the detection of the people's predetermined attribute”); and

performing a predefined action item to automatically adjust said device when said user activity is identified (see col. 11 lines 51-62 “When a person makes a motion of applying forefinger to the front of the mouth or plugging the ears with the hands, the control object candidate determination section 3 determines as a candidate the television that outputs sound, and the control content candidate determination section 4 determines the reduction of the sound volume as a candidate for the content of control.”).

wherein the predefined activity is not related to controlling the device. It is interpreted that the predefined activity (a person makes a motion of applying forefinger to the front of the mouth or plugging the ears with the hands) is not related to controlling the device (the reduction of the sound volume)

5. As for **Claim 11**, the limitations of Claim 11 can be found in the limitations of Claim

1. Claim 11 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to Claim 1. Claim 11 further requires:

a system for controlling a media player, comprising: a memory for storing computer readable code (see Imagawa col. 4 lines 24-28 "the operator selection section 2 may determine an evaluation value for each person based on an evaluation method predetermined based on people's attributes in order to select a person having an evaluation value that is larger than a reference value and that is also the largest". It is inherent that the operator selection section 2 has a memory for storing computer readable code that is used to store the person's evaluation value); and

a processor operatively coupled to said memory (It is inherent that the operator selection section 2 has a processor that is operatively coupled to said memory that will compare to judge the person's evaluation value is larger than a reference value).

6. As to **Claim 15**, the limitations of Claim 15 can be found in the limitations of Claim 5. Claim 15 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to Claim 5.

7. As for **Claim 16**, the limitations of Claim 16 can be found in the limitations of Claim 6. Claim 16 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to Claim 6. Claim 16 further requires:

a memory for storing computer readable code (see Imagawa col. 4 lines 24-28 "the operator selection section 2 may determine an evaluation value for

Art Unit: 2617

each person based on an evaluation method predetermined based on people's attributes in order to select a person having an evaluation value that is larger than a reference value and that is also the largest". It is inherent that the operator selection section 2 has a memory for storing computer readable code that is used to store the person's evaluation value); and

a processor operatively coupled to said memory (It is inherent that the operator selection section 2 has a processor that is operatively coupled to said memory that will compare to judge the person's evaluation value is larger than a reference value).

9. As for **Claim 21**, the limitations of Claim 21 can be found in the limitations of Claim

1. Claim 21 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to Claim 1. Claim 21 further requires:

a computer readable medium having computer readable code means embodied thereon (see Imagawa col. 4 lines 24-28 "the operator selection section 2 may determine an evaluation value for each person based on an evaluation method predetermined based on people's attributes in order to select a person having an evaluation value that is larger than a reference value and that is also the largest". It is inherent that the operator selection section 2 has a memory for storing computer readable code that is used to store the person's evaluation value).



10. As for **Claim 22**, the limitations of Claim 22 can be found in the limitations of Claim

6. Claim 21 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to Claim 6. Claim 21 further requires:

a computer readable medium having computer readable code means embodied thereon (see Imagawa col. 4 lines 24-28 "the operator selection section 2 may determine an evaluation value for each person based on an evaluation method predetermined based on people's attributes in order to select a person having an evaluation value that is larger than a reference value and that is also the largest". It is inherent that the operator selection section 2 has a memory for storing computer readable code that is used to store the person's evaluation value).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims **Claims 2,3 7,8 12,13, 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa et al. in view of DeVito. (U.S. PG-PUB # 2001/0056225).

11. As for **Claims 2,3 7,8 12,13, 17 and 18** the claims differ in that Imagawa et al. do not expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command

to pause said media player. However, in the same field of endeavor, DeVito teaches a method and apparatus for measuring and analyzing the psychological states of a subject and using the gathered information to control devices, such as media players. See DeVito [0003] "the present invention relates to the measurement and real-time analysis of bioelectrical signals for interaction with electronic media, such as motion pictures, digital video, video games," and [0010] "A presence detecting function which senses the relationship of a subject to a predetermined space may be used to select an object or appliance to be controlled within a space. The control signals may be used to affect objects e.g., a compact disk player," and also [0112] "Additionally, a delay may be specified which causes **the movie to pause for the specified duration** before proceeding to the next scene or set. Such a delay may be used, for example, **to wait for a change in the subject's emotional state**, which change then directs the branching of the movie to the next scene." And also see [0116] "The script may also specify that **playback should halt until** a specified criteria is satisfied. One example is a rapid eye movement ("REM") trigger, which is particularly useful for use with interactive dream movies or for triggering dream stimulus . . . **Another example may be to wait for the beta band power and the median beta frequency to exceed thresholds indicating the viewer is paying attention.**" Clearly, DeVito teaches analyzing the emotional state of a subject that comprises pausing or halting playback of a media player when the emotional state of the user indicates that the user is not paying attention to the media player. In light of

the teaching of DeVito, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Imagawa et al. to have the media player be paused in response to an indication that the user is not paying attention to the media player. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to not have a user miss a programming that is displayed on a media player, when it is determined that the user is not paying attention to the media player.

12. As for **Claim 3, 8, 13, and 18**, the claims differ in that neither Imagawa et al. nor DeVito expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to said media player to begin recording. However, Official Notice (MPEP § 2144.03) is taken that both the concepts and advantages of automatically recording a programming being played on a media player are well known and expected in the art. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Imagawa et al. and DeVito to have the emotional state that is analyzed by the system indicating that the user is not paying attention to the media player and a command is issued to the media player to record the programming. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to give the user an opportunity to watch the program at a later time when the user is able to pay attention to the media player.

Claims **4, 9, 14**, and **19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa et al. in view of Kimoto et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,054,981).

13. As for **Claims 4, 9, 14**, and **19** the claims differ in that Imagawa does not expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to said media player to enter a power save mode. However, Kimoto et al. teaches a method and apparatus for power saving modes for a media player (such a computer monitor) when the media player has been on, but not in use for a specified amount of time (see Kimoto et al. col. 1 lines 8-12 "In order to reduce power consumption, computer monitors have been designed having a power-save mode that is automatically selected after the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time." When the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time, this condition is interpreted as the user has not been paying attention to said media player for specified amount of time.) In light of the teaching of Kimoto et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Imagawa to issue a command to said media player to enter a power save mode when the user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to conserve energy consumed by the media player when the user is not paying attention to the media

Art Unit: 2617

player. (see Kimoto et al. col. 1 lines 8-12 "In order to reduce power consumption, computer monitors have been designed having a power-save mode that is automatically selected after the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time." ).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kirubel Aklilu whose telephone number is 571-272-7342. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelly can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA  
8/8/05

  
NGOC-YENVU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER